

through vigorous investigation while acting as attorney for the United States.

Aside from the fact that Mr. Knox's sympathies are naturally with the trust system, he is greatly handicapped in the discharge of his duty toward the United States by reason of the fact that everything which the United States Attorney General should know in his fight against the trust Mr. Knox knows and obtained in a confidential way. Is there an individual in the United States who would care to employ as his attorney a man who had acted as attorney for an opponent and aided that opponent in devising methods whereby this individual could be wronged?

It is impossible that Mr. Knox, having served as attorney for the trust in paving the way for the violation of the very laws which he is now called upon to enforce, should enforce those laws as the interests of the United States require.

Mr. Knox is a great lawyer, otherwise the trusts would not have employed him. But there are many other great lawyers in the United States today. The republican party is full of great lawyers, and among them are many men who could be depended upon to exercise the ability and fidelity essential to the enforcement of the anti-trust law. Why did not the McKinley administration select as its Attorney General one of this number? Why did it choose as Attorney General the most conspicuous trust lawyer in the United States?

Trickery of Words.

The Chicago Chronicle warns "democrats in and out of conventions" that "sonorous declarations against 'imperialism' and 'colonialism' will not do." The Chronicle adds that "something more than mere declamation is needed. If democrats are opposed to imperialism what do they propose to give the people in its place?"

Then the Chronicle complains that the Ohio platform, because of its indefiniteness on this subject is lamentably weak. It insists that this question must be met "intelligently, courageously and entirely free from demagoguery and mere trickery of words." This is good advice; but if the advice be sound on the question of imperialism why is not similar advice sound on the money question?

The opponents of bimetalism would have the democratic conventions indulge in "sonorous declarations." But the advocates of bimetalism have said that "something more than mere declamation is needed." They have held that if democrats have any opinion on the money question, they should state that opinion "intelligently, courageously and entirely free from demagoguery and mere trickery of words."

But today the men for whom the Chicago Chronicle stands sponsor, while objecting to bimetalism and protesting against the definiteness with which democratic conventions have declared their position on the money question, insist upon a money plank composed of "sonorous declarations."

Why do not these gentlemen give the people "something more than declamation?" If the single gold standard is right, why do they not abandon the "trickery of words" and boldly

announce to the people their preference for the single gold standard?

Why does the Chicago Chronicle insist upon clearness and directness of statement so far as concerns the question of imperialism while it has no protest to make against a "trickery of words" in the democratic platforms on the money question?

What the Chronicle says on the form of the plank relating to imperialism, the bimetalists in the democratic party have said on the form of the plank relating to the money question: "Something more than mere declamation is needed. If democrats are opposed to bimetalism, what do they propose to give the people in its place?"

If the men who seek to reorganize the democratic party are opposed to bimetalism, what do they propose to give the people in its place? Do they propose to give them the single gold standard? If so, why not say so "intelligently, courageously and entirely free from demagoguery and mere trickery of words."

Giving Away Public Lands.

Recently considerable has been said by some of the newspapers of the country in criticism of what they call the "El Reno land lottery."

Conspicuous among the fault-finders of the method by which the Kiowa-Comanche reservations were opened to settlement is the Chicago Tribune, an ardent republican newspaper, whose ideas concerning the "rights of the people, old and young, of the country," must have changed materially in recent years, or else have been woefully out of harmony with the principles of its party and the actions of that party's leaders in giving a large part of our public domain to wealthy corporations.

After commenting on the good fortune of those who drew first prizes, the Tribune says:

"Nor can the cheers of the crowd over the fortunate ones disguise the fact that the value of this choice, as well as that of the first choice, won by a young Oklahoma man, and that of the other 'grand prizes,' and, indeed, that of all the 13,000 choices, really belonged to all the wage-earners and other people, young and old, of the whole country, and would aggregate millions enough to stretch a hundred or two miles of good roads or to endow extensive educational advantages in every state and territory of the union. Since this land actually belonged to the nation, it should have been sold by the nation for the benefit of the nation. Congress, yielding to the clamor of the people in adjacent regions for a perpetuation of traditions in the land office which are no longer appropriate, precluded such a disposition, and thus made the government the manager of probably the most stupendous raffle ever witnessed. The plan is better than that of a literal 'rush' for locations, but the policy of disposing of the public domain by a 'wheel of chance' is one to which the administration should never again be forced. The responsibility for this case lies with congress, and that body should at its next session forestall any repetition of this inequitable and demoralizing method."

There seems to be no defense, in the consideration of the Tribune, to the giving away of a few hundred thousand acres of land to thirteen thousand American men and women who desired to find a means of livelihood. In fact, the Tribune asserts that the "land belongs to the nation and should have been sold by the nation for the benefit of the nation." It would seem that the Tribune does not believe in the giving away of land under any consideration, and if it does not believe in the giving away

of land to the poor and homeless, under agreement on their part to immediately improve the land and thus create a demand for labor and the products of labor, how does it justify the record of the republican party in giving away the public domain to great corporations under conditions not nearly so compulsory as to the immediate expenditure of money and labor on the part of those corporations receiving such grants.

According to Mr. Spofford, former librarian of congress, grants were made to different corporations as follows:

	Acres.
July 1, 1862, to Union Pacific.....	12,000,000
July 1, 1862, to Central Br. U. P.....	187,000
July 1, 1862, to Kansas Pacific.....	6,000,000
March 3, 1869, to Union Pacific (successor to Denver Pacific).....	1,000,000
July 1, 1862, March 2, 1864, March 3, 1855, May 21, 1866, to Central Pacific (successor to the Western Pacific).....	1,100,000
1864, to Burlington & Missouri.....	2,441,000
1864, to Sioux City & Pacific.....	60,000
1864, to Northern Pacific.....	47,000,000
1866, to Oregon Branch Central Pacific..	3,000,000
1866, to Oregon & California.....	3,500,000
1866, to Atlantic & Pacific.....	42,000,000
1868, to Southern Pacific.....	3,520,000
1871, to Southern Pacific.....	6,000,000
July 1, 1862, to Central Pacific.....	8,000,000

Total135,800,000

What gigantic figures these are, and what a robbery it must have been if we adopt the reasoning of the Tribune on the late "El Reno lottery" and declare that "this land actually belonged to the nation and should have been sold by the nation for the benefit of the nation!"

If one takes the trouble to compute, he will find that this land given away to great corporations by the republican party during the first ten years of its existence almost exactly equals the combined area of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware Maryland and Virginia—or lacking only the Carolinas of equaling the entire area of the United States at the time we declared our independence. What did the railroads do in return for these monstrous grants?

A few statistics on railroad building will be of interest here.

In 1860 there were 30,600 miles of railroad in the United States. The bulk of these grants were given during the first half of the decade beginning with 1860, and nearly all had been given by the year 1866. In 1870 there were 52,856 miles of railroad in the United States, a gain during the decade of 22,000 miles. In 1880 we had 93,526 miles of railway, a little over 60,000 miles more than we had in 1860, and yet from 15 to 18 years had elapsed since the bulk of this land had been granted to these corporations. In 1890 we had 161,397 miles of railroad—thus building within the decade from 1880 to 1890, without any public grants of land whatever, nearly 68,000 miles of road, and more than was built in the two decades preceding 1880 with the aid of those enormous grants. Since 1890 we have built about 40,000 miles more of railway without any government aid whatever, and a great deal of that, too, in the midst of the greatest money panic this country has ever seen, and yet as a result of giving away land equal in area to eleven states only 60,000 miles were constructed between 1860 and 1880.

History and experience have proved that railways will be built whenever there is an adequate demand for their services, and there have been instances in this country where they have been built in excess of the demand and without any government aid.